

October 11, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9923

to you? You might be in the position next year of objecting to a nomination in your state."

The use of the "club" system does no credit to the Senate. A nominee should be considered by the committee as a whole, and publicly rejected or approved on the basis of his record.

The McClatchy newspapers of California—including the Sacramento Bee, Fresno Bee, and Modesto Bee—stated in their October 2, 1968 editorial, as follows:

MURPHY HURTS POOLE

The nomination of US Attorney Cecil Poole to a federal judgeship, a well deserved appointment for a distinguished Northern Californian, has not received the support of US Sen. George Murphy of California.

This is shocking. Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel of California has told the Senate Judiciary Committee of his approval but Sen. Murphy has not. This plays into the hands of Sen. James Eastland of Mississippi, a confirmed racist who heads the Judiciary Committee and welcomes the chance to hold Poole's nomination in committee because of his objection to Poole being a Negro.

Sen. Murphy admits he has forwarded derogatory information about Poole to the Judiciary Committee, information which apparently is false and misleading. If he really believes Poole is not qualified to be a federal judge then Poole should be given the chance to have his qualifications judged in public.

Since Poole's nomination was sent to the Senate last May 19 other individuals have been nominated for federal judgeships. Except for the last person who was nominated only two weeks ago all of the nominees have been given a hearing.

There is no justification for the refusal of the Eastland committee to hold a hearing on Poole. And it is outrageous that Sen. Murphy would play a part in Eastland's racist-motivated stalling.

The Oakland Post editorial of October 2, 1968 stated:

CECIL F. POOLE—FEDERAL JUDGESHIP DECISION

On May 29, 1968, U.S. Attorney Cecil F. Poole, of San Francisco, a Negro, was nominated by President Johnson to fill a vacancy as a Federal District Judge in San Francisco. Until yesterday no action had been taken on this appointment, which must be approved by the Senate in order to be effective. The delay of the Senate's action could mean the denial of the appointment of Poole, but what is more important, it would deny Negroes of the State of California the representation of a member of their race on the highest federal bench in this district. By training, years of service and dedication, Cecil Poole is eminently qualified for this position and represents an example of the kind of attorney that should occupy this position.

POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The inaction in Poole's case has taken on serious political implications as far as the black people of the state are concerned. For though the position of the Federal Judge is non-partisan, it is impossible to overlook the fact that Poole is a long-time Democrat, having served under former Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, and having been appointed U.S. Attorney by President John F. Kennedy. He has been approved by the Senate for his post as U.S. Attorney at a time when Democrats controlled the Senate and the Presidency. His conduct in office is unquestioned and his record shows him to be a seasoned lawyer, able administrator and learned in the law.

The Democratic caucus in the House of Representatives recommended him to the President. President Johnson nominated him for the judgeship but his problem rests in the fact that the two Republican Senators of the state of California must make their

recommendations to the Senate Judiciary Committee, the committee which must ultimately pass on his nomination and move it on to the Senate Floor for ratification.

Republican Senator Thomas H. Kuchel has approved Poole's appointment, but Senator George Murphy sent back his blue card unsigned. Under pressure from the newspapers throughout the state, who are 100 percent behind Poole's appointment, Senator Murphy has stated that he does not oppose Poole's endorsement, but that he had received objections to Poole's appointment from federal marshals who visited his office recently. The marshals' objection to Poole was based on the fact that Poole refused to prosecute five demonstrators the marshal had arrested in January during a draft protest demonstration at the Oakland Induction Center.

The demonstrators could not produce their draft cards at the marshals' request. It is interesting to note that the discretion to prosecute persons charged with crimes under the federal jurisdiction of the U.S. Attorney's office rests with the U.S. Attorney and not marshals who work as investigators and policemen under the federal jurisdiction. Poole was exercising a discretion which was his alone in this matter and he stated that he refused to prosecute these demonstrators because he felt that their action did not warrant felony prosecution. Extra-judicial observations by marshals should not be allowed to influence Senators to act unwarrantedly and to deny the people of the state of California and specifically the minorities, representation by competent Negroes on the Federal bench of this district.

POOLE'S DAY IN COURT

In this Presidential election year when the Republican and Democratic parties are appealing to the Negroes of the United States for their support in the selection of the President, it is acts like these which give the Negroes the best opportunity to make a value judgement on which party has his basic interests at heart.

The appointment of Cecil Poole to the federal district judgeship of Northern California is an issue that "takes the rag off the bush" and gives the two million Negroes in the state, coupled with another 25 million who live throughout the breadth of this great republic, an opportunity to see which party is willing to come to grips basically with the establishment of Negroes in the mainstream of American life. The action toward Cecil Poole cannot be a total condemnation of the Republican party but it must be observed that if Cecil Poole is not appointed, it will be the responsibility of Sen. George Murphy and other prominent Republicans in the state to explain to the Negro community why not.

Probably the most unfair aspect of the entire episode to date is the fact that Poole has not had an opportunity to go before the Senate Judiciary Committee to answer the phantom charges that have been leveled against him. It is the belief of all that know him, that if Poole is given an opportunity to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he would adequately answer their inquiries and the whole question of his eligibility and suitability for a Federal judgeship would be decided on its merits. This does not seem to be asking too much and this act would result in Poole having his day in court in a public hearing by the committee.

It is important to point out, too, that the Senate Judiciary Committee is headed by Senator James O. Eastland, Democrat of Mississippi. He states that his requirement for action on a nominee for a judgeship is approval by both of the state's Senators. A senator gives his approval by signing and returning an official blue card to the committee.

Senator Murphy says he is not opposing Poole's appointment. Aides report that Senator Kuchel returned his signed card weeks ago. Senator Murphy has returned his card

unsigned, thus affording certain grounds for objection by Eastland.

The political overtones of Cecil Poole's case can be terribly important in the political fight for the Negro vote in the state of California on all levels. Negroes throughout the state should contact Republican office holders, whether they be seeking State Assembly or Senatorial offices, or national seats, to insist that they contact the Republican candidates and call upon them to use their influence to place Poole's nomination before the Senate so that the issue of his qualifications may be finally decided.

Those who have worked with him and observed him in his official capacity as assistant district attorney of San Francisco, clemency secretary and counsel to Governor Brown, and in his years as United States Attorney are satisfied that once his nomination gets on the Senate floor, it will be approved and U.S. Attorney Cecil Poole will become the first black federal judge on the Pacific Coast.

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BURTON of California's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. TALCOTT's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. TALCOTT's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great and grand characters of American public life who has adorned the profession of politics is James A. Farley, whose friends call him Jim. He has played an illustrious part in the building of today and in the protection of tomorrow. He never was untrue to a friend. He was never unfair to an opponent. He has come through many bitter political struggles with his character unblemished and public respect and esteem undiminished.

I submit herewith, Mr. Speaker, two interesting articles; one article about him while attending the recent Democratic Convention and the other by him in the October issue of Esquire magazine which will both inform and delight all who read them:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News, Aug. 29, 1968]

OLD POLITICIAN FARLEY WATCHES, CARES

(By Walker Stone)

CHICAGO, August 28.—James A. Farley, 80 years of age, six feet, two inches tall, balances on the balls of his feet as he listens to re-

H 9924

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 11, 1968

turns on the TV set in his Blackstone Hotel suite to the roll call from the stockyards auditorium.

It is the roll call on the Vietnam resolution—whether the Democrats stick with their president or take off in a new direction.

There is perhaps no man in Chicago today to whom it could make less difference personally. Jim Farley is no longer a part of the Democratic apparatus, no longer hopeful of reward nor fearful of reprisal.

But he still cares. It is his party.

He sways back and forth, in his black mohair suit, following the returns, until it is certain the vote has upheld the Administration position on Vietnam and all the bad guys on the other side have been recorded and counted out.

To an old politician like Jim Farley it is most important that the — on the other side shall be on record, so they can be treated accordingly.

Then the incoming Democratic president can handle matters in line with the ancient and honorable rules of political spoils, even if Jim Farley has nothing to do with it.

MANAGED F.D.R.'S CAMPAIGN

He set the pattern 36 years ago.

He managed the campaign of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the Democratic nomination in Chicago. And the old Farley rule was FRBC—for Roosevelt before Chicago: You either were, and in, or you were not, and out.

That made a big difference in those days. They were not like these days.

In 1932, when Jim Farley barged into Chicago, carrying the FDR banner, Republican Herbert Hoover was president. There were no federal relief or welfare programs. Some 11 million were unemployed, which, compared to the present population of available working force, would mean about 20 million unemployed.

Nobody was on strike. Anyone who had a job wouldn't think of giving it up. They were the days when you accepted pay decreases to keep a job, rather than ask for any increases to stay on a job.

It was different than today, when telephone electricians have been on strike, bus drivers are on strike and taxicab drivers are on strike. It is difficult today to travel from downtown loop hotels to the stockyards amphitheater. It is practically impossible to communicate by telephone.

OLD-FASHIONED CONVENTIONS

By modern measurement, the 1932 Democratic Convention may have been the last of the old-fashioned Democratic conventions. It promised to reduce federal spending 25 percent. It promised a "federal budget annually balanced." It looked with abhorrence on a budget of 4 billion, of which almost \$1 billion went for military purposes. It was the last of the dying days when the Democrats were the party of economy—days that dated back to when Thomas Jefferson reduced the federal spending from \$7 million to \$4 million, days that dated back to when Andrew Jackson paid off the federal debt.

That was a tidy little convention Jim Farley ran here in 1932 compared to today's.

Opponents to FDR then were not as ungovernable as the McCarthy's and McGovern's of today. They were relatively reasonable, such as the rambunctious Al Smith of the east side of New York, such as Albert Ritchie, the wet governor of Maryland when prohibition was the chief urban issue; such as "Alfalfa Bill" Murray, whose farmers of the prairies thought they were being cheated.

When the fourth ballot votes nominating FDR were cast, they closed ranks, to elect a Democrat.

But 1932 must be looked back upon as a watershed in American history.

What came afterward couldn't be counted against what went before.

[From Esquire magazine, October 1968]

PRELUDE TO A THEME

To be perfectly frank, the title "Salvaging the Twentieth Century" is slightly puzzling to me. By most counts, ranging from Chief Justices of the United States to Prime Ministers and Popes, the first two-thirds of the twentieth century has advanced the human race more than all previous fifty centuries combined. Instead of how to "salvage" this century, the question might well be, "How do we maintain its miraculous progress?" Even that question seems unnecessary; the maintenance is so great that the twenty-first century will be as superior to ours as ours is to the eighteenth.

Fifty-five percent of the American people make their livings at industries which did not even exist in 1900. By way of mere mention, there are fifty million Americans who own automobiles when in 1900 there weren't 200,000 who could afford a horse. Seventy-seven million people are at work, earning eight times more in a forty-hour week than they did in the seventy-two-hour week of 1900. Yellow fever, pneumonia, infantile paralysis and the scourge of the nation, tuberculosis, are among hundreds of diseases eliminated or under control. Television and the satellites enable us to see around the world; the telephone enables us to hear and speak around the world; newspapers print almost instantly. Planes cross the continents and the oceans in hours and some can even outdistance the sun. Best of all, there are fifty million American children in schools and six and a half million in colleges. America today is a bigger, healthier, and finer country, and Americans are a bigger, healthier and finer people, and both will get better.

As a man in public life, who has met and liked tens of thousands of people who thrilled to participate in the most romantic adventure in history, the American Republic, I would be less than frank if I did not say that the deepest introspection I can bring to bear on my own experience is one of the deepest gratitude for being born to the parents I had, in this beloved land of my birth, and in taking part in its work and its government at a time when its expansion opened up new vistas for all mankind. Of my own potential, I can only say that my country and its ways expanded them to goals beyond my boyhood dreams. My errors may have been many, but the surging force of America carried me past them.

The boundless enthusiasm, optimism, sense of fair play, willingness to work and to risk transformed our country from a little people hugging the Eastern Coast to demonstrators and developers of a great and rising world civilization. As I look back to Grassy Point, New York, where I was born, and recall the public schools and the night schools of the cities which were open to a poor boy, I should lack both judgment and humility if I did not say that it was not I, but my country which supplied these great potentials which enable me to say with deepest gratitude, that I shared its enthusiasm and optimism and that it never disappointed me; and I am just optimistic and enthusiastic enough to believe America never will. P.S. What is wrong with this country is, perhaps, in the tone of your query, which seems to indicate you have reached a judgment in which all men must agree. What is wrong or right, you ask, what should be "kept, discarded or changed?" Why not multiplied, honored and advanced? I find an inherent defeatism in the sentence, "We will, in effect, be admitting our faults, citing the ways in which our society has gone wrong." I, for one, feel that our society has demonstrated that all races, creeds and religions have made more progress, incomparably elevating more people in a short time than any in history. While I have no objection to an examination of our society's faults, there is more occasion for beating of the drums than of the heart.

Optimism, not defeatism, enthusiasm not nihilism are America's assets; who strikes at them bankrupts himself as he destroys his country.

—JAMES A. FARLEY.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on this day 100 years ago the great Carlos Manuel de Cespedes, in a ringing cry for freedom declared the independence of Cuba and called his countrymen to arms.

The "Grito de Yara" issued from his sugar plantation "La Demajagua" in eastern Cuba did not result in instant freedom for the people of Cuba from the tyranny of royal Spain. There followed a decade of struggle which, lacking the support of the U.S. Government, ended in temporary failure for the drive of the Cuban people to be free. But a free and independent Cuba was to come into being before the end of the century and Carlos Manuel de Cespedes still lives in the hearts of the Cuban people as the "father of his country."

It is appropriate that we look back to the events of a century ago because the freedom-loving people of Cuba again are suffering under a tyrannical regime supported by a power beyond our hemisphere. And once again the hopes of the Cuban people for freedom are intertwined with the foreign policies of the United States and are dependent upon the support of the Government of the United States.

One hundred years ago there was an instant response to the call for independence among the "criollos"—creoles—of Oriente Province. The "Grito de Yara" was the fruit of a patriotic conspiracy that has been long in maturing. The criollos, the majority of Cubans of that day were of Spanish parents, but born in Cuba. This fact alone, however, was enough to reduce them to the condition of second-rate citizens. As citizens of the United States, we can understand the intolerable situation which denies human dignity and human rights because of an accident of birth. And 100 years ago, the natives of Cuba—who owned the land as the descendants of the conquistadores—were not allowed to participate in the administration of the colony, which remained in the middle of the 19th century in the autocratic hands of the Captain General and his advisers—the Peninsulares, born in peninsular Spain and thus the only Cubans the Crown could trust.

Since the early days of the century, when Captain General Tacon had declared Cuba in a "state of seige"—1925—the Island had been practically a land without legal protection for the individual. And this Cuba the "criollos" could no longer tolerate. In the span of a half century Cuba had become fabulously wealthy. The main source of its wealth was in agriculture—sugar, coffee, tobacco, and cattle—in products grown, processed, and sold by the "criollo" landowners. And it was upon them that the weight of taxation largely rested. The merchants, who were mostly urban "pe-

ninsulares" were to a large extent tax exempt.

Adding insult to injury in this century old picture, the bulk of Cuba's taxable income was siphoned off to Spain. In 1866, only \$800,000 of a budgetary income of \$45 million were devoted to public works in Cuba—an incredibly meager amount for investment in the development of the country.

Thus the issue of "taxation without representation" was in Cuba, in mid-nineteenth century, exactly what it had been in the United States in the years preceding the Revolutionary War. And Spain was as adamant in her denial as England had been in earlier days. True, the need for reform had been recognized by the mother country. True, also, that elections were held in Cuba to send deputies to the Junta de Informacion, convened in Madrid in 1866. True that most of the economic grievances of the Cubans were accepted by the government delegates at the junta. But nothing came of it—the "peninsulares" were too firmly entrenched in Cuba; the vested interests of the Captain General and his cronies too deeply rooted to be easily shaken. The Cuban delegates were denied all their political positions—representation in the government of the island, as well as in the Cortes of Spain was flatly refused.

When the Cuban delegates returned to their homes with empty hands, the eventual outcome was only too evident to even the casual observer. The partisans of independence were proved to be right. Nothing could be expected from Spain, then or ever. Revolution was the only way.

And that was the way the Cuban patriots took. Risking their all, their wealth as well as their lives, they took to the mountains and the fields—with their women, and their slaves. The rest would go up in flames. La Demajagua was reduced to ashes. Bayamo, one of the richest cities in eastern Cuba, shortly was put to the torch. And, since this was a people's revolution, the first thing the rebels did was to abolish the slave trade and emancipate their slaves. From that day on Cubans, black and white, have fought together for freedom, and they still do today—there had never been a racial problem in independent Cuba.

In the spring of 1869 a constitutional convention convened at Guaimaro, which enacted a democratic constitution for the Republic of Cuba. Cespedes, elected President of the new state, proceeded soon thereafter to appoint Morales Lemus, a distinguished lawyer, to represent his government in Washington, where it was already realized that American interests were in serious jeopardy as a consequence of the war. Morales Lemus was courteously received by President Grant, personally inclined to grant recognition of belligerency to the Cuban rebels. Mr. Rawlins, the Secretary of War, who immediately became an ardent partisan of the Cuban cause, went further: he urged the Government to support the revolution, both diplomatically and militarily, and proclaim for Cuban independence. But Secretary Rawlins died soon thereafter and, despite a joint resolution of the Congress

granting belligerency to the Cubans, the views of the Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, prevailed in the end and the United States opted for a policy of neutrality which lasted throughout the war.

A singular opportunity was thus lost to solve the Cuban problem in a satisfactory manner. Spain was in political turmoil, the Queen had been overthrown and the Prime Minister, General Prim, a liberal, was in favor of reaching a settlement with the United States in respect to Cuba. The Spanish Treasury was shaky at the time, the war on the island promised to be long and costly, and a handsome price to be obtained for the release of Cuba, guaranteed by the United States, seemed unquestionably attractive. But the unbending attitude of Captain General Lersundi proved an obstacle to the extension of civil rights to the Cubans—which would have put an end to the insurrection—and to the incipient negotiations tentatively suggested by Prim.

It is well to note, at this point, that practically every American Administration since the days of Jefferson had shown a marked interest in Cuba, which, according to the laws of political gravitation, was expected inevitably to embrace the Union. At least on three prior occasions—under Presidents Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan—attempts were made by the United States to purchase Cuba from Spain. The amounts offered denote the significance attached to the acquisition of the island, controlling as it did the outlets of the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic—the price of Cuba was raised successively to \$100, \$130 and \$150 million. Sums indeed fabulous for the time, especially when it is considered that the United States paid \$7 million to Napoleon for Louisiana in 1803; and \$20 million to Spain for Florida in 1819.

In the light of a century and a half of political, diplomatic, and strategic experience, our American statesmen of today may be advised to ponder whether their predecessors could have been consistently wrong in attributing to Cuba such decisive importance relative to the security of the United States. Yet today, when IRBM missiles implanted in Cuba would be capable of destroying the installations at Cape Canaveral in seconds, and the cities and military bases of the eastern seaboard and the Midwest in a matter of minutes, there is lagging American interest in Cuba. At a time when the most powerful, ruthless and deadly enemy that the United States has ever confronted holds the islands firmly in its grasp and has transformed it into the most formidable armed bastion in alien hands in Latin America, we do not seem to be dismayed or even disturbed.

It is because of this apathy, this lack of appreciation of the historic stake which the United States has in the freedom of Cuba from foreign control, that I have called upon my colleagues in the Congress to join me in declaring our determination that Cuba should be free once again and that our Government should accept its responsibility for developing a program of positive action to remove the tyrannical regime that holds Cuba in bondage today. My resolution,

House Concurrent Resolution 492, which is before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, calls upon our Government to formulate such a plan of action to remove the Castro-Communist regime by whatever means may be necessary. On this 100th anniversary of the Grito de Yara, I again urge my colleagues to give out the cry for freedom that will tell the world that the United States is committed and is actively working to restore to the family of nations a free and independent Cuba.

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very poignant sense of regret that I contemplate our brilliant, gracious, and charming colleague, EDNA KELLY, leaving this House. Her keen intellect, her animated spirit, and her constant grace have made her a distinctive adornment to this House. She has rendered immeasurable service to our country as a senior and important member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her wise counsel and long experience have enabled her to render an immeasurable contribution to her country in the shaping of its foreign policy. She has fought with dedicated zeal and determination for programs which have made our people a healthier, more prosperous, and a happier citizenship. She has added strength to countless good causes and has been an effective warrior against those who would render a disservice to the public interest. She has been ever considerate of her colleagues and a warm and treasured friend to many of us who have been privileged to serve with her. This House will be a poorer and a more drab House when this talented and dynamic lady is no longer here to lend the charm of her rich personality and her lovely and animated presence to the House scene. I am sure I speak the sentiment of every Member of this House that our warmest good wishes will accompany EDNA KELLY wherever she goes and that we are all sure that wherever she is will be a better place for her being there. May her years be long and happy.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ELMER HOLLAND

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the noblest men who ever served in this House was Elmer Holland. During the many years that he worked and fought in this House he advanced the cause not only of the working people to whom he felt a special devotion but to all the people of this country. Legislation which he has sponsored and supported has immeasurably strengthened this Nation—given better education to its young and better training to its older; more satisfactory housing to a great host; more adequate health care to millions and the hope of a richer and better life to all.

H 9926

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 11, 1968

He was true to the cause of duty. He was unfaltering in his loyalty to what he thought was right and unswerving in his resistance to what he considered wrong. He was a tower of strength to a good cause and a bulwark of opposition to a bad one. He was a great gentleman, a kind man, a patriot, an able counselor to his country, a distinguished, knowledgeable, and dedicated legislator. His service has added to the luster of this House, contributed to making today better and tomorrow more secure. I join my colleagues in heartfelt tribute to Elmer Holland and will ever cherish his memory and his friendship.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN MAKES GREAT RECORD

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 90th Congress nears an end I want to express appreciation to a distinguished colleague who has made a great record as a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.

As the only woman in the House of Representatives to head a subcommittee dealing with appropriations, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] has made a splendid record handling funding for the Department of Interior and a number of related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service.

The appropriations bills which Mrs. HANSEN's subcommittee brings to the floor often involve some of the most controversial and difficult legislative matters to be considered by Congress, but their debate and consideration have been marked by courtesy and commonsense, and the gentlewoman who is chairman has demonstrated a keen understanding of the fine points of debate as well as the legislation before us.

The gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] has been a strong and effective champion of conservation, resource development, educational improvements, and progress for the American Indian. Her committee leadership post enables her to contribute significantly to progress on all of these matters.

The conservationists and Indians of Oklahoma regard JULIA BUTLER HANSEN as one of their best friends in Congress.

It is both a privilege and a pleasure to serve with her.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 90TH CONGRESS

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, now that we are near adjournment time, I wish to put in the Record a summary of what I believe to be several of the highlights of the 90th Congress. The following is my report to the people of Rhode Island's Second Congressional District. The topics covered in my newsletter include a discussion on law-enforcement legislation,

air pollution and solid waste disposal facility problems, housing for the elderly, education, consumer legislation, and proposals for Federal statutes on the fight against crime.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF RHODE ISLAND'S SECOND DISTRICT

LAW-ENFORCEMENT LEGISLATION

One of the most significant pieces of legislation to be enacted into law in the 90th Congress was the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. As a supporter of this act, I thought it appropriate to discuss what this new law seeks to do and what its effect should be in assisting our local and state police authorities to preserve law and order.

The primary basis for this national legislation was that while the Federal government could not engage directly in local law enforcement, the government could and should provide substantial financial and technical assistance to local police departments.

Under the law enforcement grant section, the following is included:

1. Planning grants for the creation of state and local anti-crime plans.
2. Funds to develop methods and equipment to strengthen law enforcement.
3. Action grants to recruit and train police officers.
4. Federal funds to construct buildings and other law enforcement facilities.
5. Grants to establish and train special units to combat organized crime.
6. Programs to educate the public about crime prevention.
7. Funds to recruit and train special riot control and prevention units.

In the areas of training and research, the Omnibus Crime Control Act establishes a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to encourage research and demonstrations in law enforcement methods. This legislation also authorizes payments to colleges and universities for loans of up to \$1800 a year for enrollment in courses leading to degrees in an area related to enforcement and scholarships up to \$300 per college semester for individuals enrolled in a law enforcement course.

Two other important provisions of the Crime Control Act permit police wiretapping in investigations of specific Federal and state crimes and prohibits interstate shipment of hand guns to individuals. The latter provision also prohibits the selling of firearms to persons known to be convicted felons, fugitives or under indictment by a grand jury.

THE CONSUMER CONGRESS

The dollar and the safety of the American consumer have long been challenged by unfair loan practices, misleading advertising, and faulty merchandise. The 90th Congress responded to the challenge with unprecedented legislation to protect the consumer. The legislation included several bills for which I helped to secure passage.

I co-sponsored and spoke on the Floor for the Consumer Credit Act of 1968 which requires lenders and retail creditors to furnish their customers with full information about the cost of credit. Consumers will now know the exact interest rates they pay. I am certain that this will assist them in making intelligent choices in financing their purchases.

Fire prevention is part of consumer protection. About 150,000 people a year are injured in clothing fires and thousands more are burned in fires involving bedding, curtains and upholstery. I supported the 1967 Amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act which gave the Secretary of Commerce the power to issue standards for the flammability of fabrics when it is necessary to protect the public interest.

I gave special attention to the Fire Safety and Research Act of 1968 which was handled

by the Science Committee of which I am a member. The bill authorizes studies into the causes of fires and investigation of new methods of fire prevention and control. It also provides for the establishment of new training programs to improve fire-fighting techniques. Fire is still a major threat to lives and property, and this constructive legislation should further modernize fire prevention and control programs.

It may startle you to discover that each year the average American eats about 27 pounds of red meat that may be tainted or diseased thanks to inadequate or non-existent meat inspection in many states. I was pleased to speak on the House Floor in support of the Wholesale Meat Act of 1967 which assists and requires states to upgrade their meat inspection procedure.

By 1969, all state inspection programs will have to meet Federal inspection standards. The Wholesome Poultry Products Act of 1968 which likewise had my backing considerably raises standards in the inspection of poultry.

Another consumer problem involved unsafe pipelines used in the transmission of natural gas. I gave my complete support to the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 which enables the Secretary of Transportation to set minimum safety standards for the transportation and storage of natural gas.

Consumer safety and consumer dollar stability are the concern of all Americans. I was pleased to join in this record-setting Congressional effort. The legislation consumer-protector of this Congress is by no means the final answer to this question, but I believe it does go along toward eliminating the most flagrant abuses of consumer rights.

QUALITY EDUCATION

I am pleased to report to you on the record of the 90th Congress in the field of education. During the past session, the Congress sought to remedy a host of problems facing our nation's educational system. The proposals that were enacted were not short-sighted or stop-gap measures, but rather a systematic attempt to anticipate the needs that the field of education will present in the decade of the 1970's.

Our nation is faced with the problems of urban unrest, an increasing crime rate, and a growing disrespect for established law. Congress acted positively by soundly investing in innovative educational programs that will produce the much needed dividends of individual sensitivity and responsibility and an understanding and respect for our institutions.

We met these challenges with the following measures:

1. Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which refunded the successful Headstart Program and provided special programs in schools serving low-income neighborhoods. Also included in the 1967 Amendments were provisions for special programs for non-English speaking families, handicapped children, and educational research and training facilities.

2. In the much neglected field of vocational education three acts were passed that provided (a) loans to finance tuition payments at business, trade and technical schools, (b) Federal support for training of the unemployed in order to meet needs in areas where there are occupational skill shortages, and (c) increased research in order to foster comprehensive vocational education.

3. In the area of higher education where the cost of a college education is becoming a major hardship to many students and their families the Congress passed far-reaching amendments to the existing Higher Education Act. It is now possible for needy students to obtain grants, fellowships for careers in public services, and reduced-interest insured loans that will enable them to pursue a college career.

We took these steps in an attempt to